

# WPS Memorandum

WINTEROWD PLANNING SERVICES, INC.

---

TO: Comprehensive Plan Review Steering Committee

FROM: Comprehensive Plan Review TAC, 60/40 Sub-Committee

DATE: 12.7.2000

RE: Interim Resolution to the 60/40 Plan Policies

---

The TAC has held numerous conversations and meetings regarding the 60/40 plan policies and what steps, if any, should be taken to address the concerns raised by the local governments. Each community has had one or more opportunities, either formally or informally, to discuss the merits of 60/40 and, many jurisdictions have provided testimony to the County Planning Commission this fall on the same topic.

There appears to be general consensus among the TAC representatives of each city that appropriate changes should be made to the 60/40 policies. As a group, we have used the working paper, "*Policy Paper # 5, 60/40 Housing Type Policy*", as a foundation for our work. Option number 3, on page four of Policy Paper # 5, suggests that the policy language can be restated using average densities, a required mix of housing types and a cap on individual housing types. (*That option is listed on the attached County Summary paper as #4*).

Our suggestions for addressing the ramifications of this option follow as well as draft plan policy amendments that we are attaching for illustration purposes. However, we are not asking you to adopt the draft policy changes at this time. Such specific language must be worked out at through the subsequent GMA Update public hearing process. Consistent with the Steering Committee's approach towards all the other Policy Papers, which is to not propose specific policy amendment language, we ask that the Steering Committee consider (a) the following framework for consensus; (b) the proposal for additional policy language in other areas, such as enforcement and jobs to housing balance; and (c) the attached draft policy changes as recommendations to the County Board of Commissioners for further action consistent with these directions.

## **Premise:**

The plan policies found in *Section A* of the Community Framework Plan (CFP) and Goal 5.7.1 that require the jurisdictions to provide housing opportunities at a ratio of 60 % single family to 40% multi-family have not been met by the majority of cities in Clark

County and are unlikely to be met in some jurisdictions the near future. The 60/40 policies assume that all jurisdictions, regardless of size, location, economic opportunities, infrastructure, history, and projected growth will develop single family and multi-family housing at the same ratio. Over the past five years, the new housing market has not responded equally in all jurisdictions.

### **Areas of Agreement**

As a result of more than 6 months of discussions, meetings and multiple draft policy amendments crafted by all the jurisdictions, there appears to be general agreement on several fundamental premises. The areas of potential agreement are summed up as follows:

1. The Clark County Comprehensive Plan Policy Paper # 5, 60/40 Housing Type Policy, identifies five (5) options for change. (See page 4 of Policy Paper # 5.) The current policy makes the assumption that multi-family housing is the key to satisfying the remand order of the Hearing Board. Option # 3 would restate the 60/40 plan policy by using averaged density, a mix of housing types, and a cap on any single type of housing as a mechanism to respond to the remand. In addition, ensuring minimum levels of housing density will address countywide concerns about the need to secure affordable housing. The TAC representatives from each city recommend that the Steering Committee pursue Option # 3 .
2. Any 60/40 replacement(s) should (1) result in an equitable distribution of housing types, (2) be performance based, and (3) should be supported by an objective compliance mechanism.
3. The linkage between the 60/40 language, its successor, and the land tenure language found in policy 5.7 in Section B of the CFP should be severed.
4. Any change in policy should be applicable to a jurisdiction's corporate limits and its UGA.
5. Each jurisdiction shall adopt a density minimum and maximum for each residential district.
6. Consistent with the adopted CFP, jurisdictions should be classified by tiers that reflect the actual and planned character of the jurisdictions. The jurisdictional tiers should reflect small town and major urban center qualities.
7. Consistent with the CFP, smaller should assume a lesser minimum density than larger jurisdictions. (**For example**, smaller towns could meet a net minimum density of 4 DU/Ac., medium centers could meet a net minimum density of 6 DU/Ac/, and larger urban centers could meet a minimum net density of 8 DU/Ac.)

8. The County should recalibrate the county wide 6/16 density assumption to match the minimum average density standard applied to each jurisdictional tier.
9. Each jurisdiction shall adopt a cap on any single housing type. (**For example,** there could be a cap that limits large lot single-family detached dwellings to 75% of the housing stock.
10. The replacement policy language should adopt definitions of housing type that all jurisdictions can agree upon, and should avoid casual or generic use of terms such as, “single family” and “multi-family”.
11. Each jurisdiction must adopt implementation measures that will ensure that the jurisdiction is making a good faith effort to meet its own minimum net density goal.
12. Performance should be based upon a 1994 baseline and performance should be monitored annually.
13. The County should adopt stand-alone policies that specifically address the “jobs to housing balance” issue.
14. The County should adopt stand-alone enforcement mechanism(s) that can be called into play when a jurisdiction fails to comply with the CFP. The enforcement mechanism should not be specific to housing goals alone. (It may be that the enforcement mechanisms are already in place, i.e., litigation before the Growth Management Hearings Board or the inability to expand a growth boundary.)

### **Proposed Next Steps**

The Steering Committee can agree upon the fundamental principals outlined above, agree that the draft policy changes are a good working draft worthy of additional refinement, and could forward such comments to the County Board of Commissioners. The details of the amendments should be worked out during the public hearing process.